

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 08 2006

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the objections and rejections set forth in the Final Office Action mailed 8 February 2006 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1–11, renumbered by amendment as requested by the Examiner, Office Action mailed 8 February 2006 at 3, are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 5 were further amended to recite the unique element of a user CTI control mechanism having a browser interface. Support for these amendments can be found in the Specification at, for example, page 60, lines 5–20. Other portions of the specification provide support for the feature of a CTI control mechanism having a browser interface, as well.

While explicitly not intending to limit or otherwise affect the scope of the claims, it is useful to briefly review a portion of the specification with respect to the CTI control mechanism having a browser interface. For example, as discussed at page 60, lines 21 et seq. relative to one embodiment, “since the PC call control feature is browser based, there is no desktop application to install, and the PC call control capability is compatible with multiple computers and operating systems.” Furthermore, page 60, lines 8–33 describe a “virtual desktop which allows a computer browser and a telephone at a location other than a user’s regular office, e.g., an “alternative office” or a “virtual office”, to be logically associated with the user. . . . An alternative office within the company is any location that has access to both a gateway telephone, and a desktop workstation having a browser, the workstation coupled to the company’s data network.” Again, while not limiting or otherwise affecting the scope of the claims, these portions of the specification illustrate the usefulness, in some examples, of the CTI control mechanism having a browser interface.

Turning now to the rejections specifically, claims 1 and 3–9 (corresponding to original claims 154 and 156–162) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,584,094 to Maroulis, *et al.* (“Maroulis”), in combination with U.S. Patent No. 6,463,051 to Ford (“Ford”). Claims 2, 10, and 11 (corresponding to original claims 155 and 163–164) were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Maroulis and Ford as applied to claims 1 and 5 (originally claims 154 and 158) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,946,386 to Rogers (“Rogers”). These rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the following remarks.

SVOXP003

Best Available Copy

Regarding the rejection of claims 1 and 3–9, Maroulis describes a communications system in which a first PBX coupled to a first internet gateway device determines whether or not a second PBX has access to a second internet gateway device. If so, then the second PBX sends the IP (internet protocol) address of the second internet gateway device to the first PBX, and the first PBX sends the IP address of the first internet gateway device to the second PBX. All communications occur over the PSTN (public switched telephone network) or over a network signaling channel (or both). The first and second internet gateway devices then set up a voice communications path over the internet between the first and second PBXes. Maroulis also describes a system that includes a first PBX coupled to a first internet gateway device and to a first POTS telephone. A first PBX is equipped to establish a communications path with a second PBX over the PSTN (public switched telephone network) or over a network signaling channel (or both). The second PBX is coupled to the second POTS telephone. In response to a telephone number entered into the first POTS telephone and corresponding to a second PBX, the first PBX establishes a signaling path to the second PBX. The first PBX constructs a request packet which includes the IP (internet protocol) address of the first PBX, the IP address of the first internet gateway device, and the telephone number dialed into the first POTS telephone. The first PBX sends the request packet to the second PBX over the PSTN, and/or over the network signaling channel. In response to the receipt of the request packet, the second PBX checks to determine whether or not it is coupled to a second internet gateway. If so, the second PBX constructs a response packet including the IP address of the second gateway, and sends the response packet to the first PBX over the PSTN, and/or over the network signaling channel. Upon receipt of the response packet, the first PBX sends a reservation signal to the first gateway device and, in response to the reservation signal, the first gateway device requests the internet to provide two internet channels between the first gateway and the second gateway. See Maroulis at Column 1, line 54, through Column 2, line 30.

Maroulis does not show or suggest a communication system comprising the unique feature of a user CTI control mechanism having a browser interface as required by the pending claims.

Ford does not address the deficiencies of Maroulis. Ford describes an Internet phone server bridge system is coupled with a telephone system, which routes predetermined long distance calls to the bridge system. The telephone numbers for the called party are converted by the phone server bridge into a corresponding Internet provider address for that party. Ford at

SVOXP003

Column 2, lines 54–60. Ford does not show or suggest a communication system comprising the unique feature of a user CTI interface and control mechanism configured to provide access to an enterprise directory as required by the pending claims.

Thus, the cited combination of Maroulis and Ford, alone or in combination, does not show or suggest the invention as recited by claims 1 and 3–9. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

The foregoing remarks are applicable to the rejection of claims 2, 10, and 11 as well. Rogers does not address the above-described deficiencies of Maroulis or Ford. Although Rogers discloses a user interface for controlling calls, see, Rogers at Columns 29–33, Rogers nowhere shows or suggests the unique element of a user CTI control mechanism having a browser interface as required by the rejected claims. Thus, the cited combination of Maroulis, Ford, and Rogers, alone or in combination, does not show or suggest the invention as recited by claims 2, 10 and 11. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

### CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Alan S. Hodes  
Reg. No. 38,185

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250

Last Available Copy

SVOXP003